**IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKAHDN AT NAINITAL**

**Writ Petition No. 166 of 2001 (S/B)**
**(Old No. 20964 of 1999)**

Jatar Singh Rawat S/o Sri J.P. Singh,
Tehsildar, Oukhimath,
District Rudraprayag. ……. Petitioner

**Versus**

1. Commissioner, Garhwal Division,
   Pauri.
2. Additional Commissioner (Administration),
   Garhwal Division, Pauri.
3. Board of Revenue, U.P.,
   Lucknow,
   Through its Secretary / Commissioner.
4. State of Uttar Pradesh,
   through Secretary (Revenue),
   U.P. Govt., Lucknow.
5. Vijay Shanker Dubey.
6. Mohammad Rizwan.
7. Ambrish Kumar Srivastava.
8. Ambhimanyu Kumar Tiwari.
9. Ramesh Chandra Shukla.
10. Ghanshyam.
11. Ram Prakash.
12. Darshan Singh Nigam.
13. Ramjee Lal.
14. Virendra Prasad Pandey.
15. Sri Ram Yadav.
16. Om Prakash Tiwari.
17. Narendra Singh.
18. Satya Prakash Singh.
19. Jagdamba Prasad Gupta.
20. Awdhesh Singh.
21. Ram Singh Gautam.
22. Chadra Shekhar Misra.
23. Ram Dutt Ram.
24. Guru Prasad.
25. Rakesh Kumar-I

    Respondents Nos. 5 to 25 are illegally placed as
    Tehsildar at Hills contrary to the Hill Cadre Rules, 1992,
    Through the Commissioner,
    Garhwal Division, Pauri. …… Respondents

Mr. B.D. Upadhyaya, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Subhash Upadhyaya, Brief Holder for respondents Nos. 1 & 2.
Mr. Beena Pandey. Standing Counsel (U.P. Govt.) for respondents Nos. 3 & 4.
None for respondents Nos 5 to 25.

**JUDGMENT**

**Coram: Hon'ble Rajeev Gupta, C.J.**
**Hon'ble J.C.S. Rawat, J.**

**RAJEEV GUPTA, C. J. (Oral)**

Mr. B.D. Upadhyaya, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Upadhyaya, Brief Holder for respondents Nos. 1 & 2.

Ms. Beena Pandey, Standing Counsel (U.P. Govt.) for respondents Nos. 3 & 4.

None for respondents Nos. 5 to 25.

2. Mr. B.D. Upadhyaya, the learned counsel for the petitioner, in view of the fact that the petitioner has retired from the service on 30.10.1999, seeks permission to withdraw the writ petition, whereby the petitioner has challenged his reversion vide order dated 04.05.1999 with the liberty of making a representation to the concerned authorities for finalization of the petitioner's pension and other retrial benefits matters expeditiously.

3. Permission granted.

4. With the above liberty, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn and it is further directed that the concerned authorities shall consider and decide the petitioner's representation in accordance with law expeditiously.

5. With the above order, CLMA No. 14049 of 2006 also stands disposed of.

**(J.C.S. Rawat, J.)** 09.05.2007

**(Rajeev Gupta, C.J.)** 09.05.2007

G